

**City of Seattle – Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)
Environmental Justice Network in Action (EJNA)
Solid Waste Outreach Final Report
Draft v.1
July 13, 2009**

Presented to:

Mr. Michael Davis, *Community Engagement Supervisor*
Ms. Marcella Wilson, *Environmental Justice Project Lead*
Ms. Sheryl Shapiro, *Environmental Justice Program Specialist*
Mr. Nic Li, *Environmental Justice Program Intern*
City of Seattle – Seattle Public Utilities

Producing Consultant:

Mr. Tim D. Wang, *Principal*
T.D. Wang Advertising Group, LLC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	
	a) Project Overview	3
	b) Background and Objectives	3
	c) Key Assumptions	4
2.0	Research Methodology	5
	a) Community-Based Organization (CBO) Partners	5
	b) Presentation Training	7
	c) Presentation Format	8
	d) Targeted Community-Based Outreach / Locations	9
3.0	Presentations Summary	9
	a) Presentations Overview	9
	b) Audience Demographics	11
	c) Audience Evaluation Responses	17
	d) CBO Evaluation Responses	18
4.0	Summary of Key Findings	19
	a) Outreach Method	20
	b) Marketing Effectiveness	21
	c) Presentation Delivery	22
	d) Target Audience Concerns	
5.0	Future Outreach Recommendations and Strategies	23
	a) Outreach Method for Targeted Audiences	23
	b) Marketing and Advertising	24
	c) Presentation Delivery and Effectiveness	25
6.0	Appendix	26
	a) CBO Roster	26
	b) Presentation Schedule	27
	c) Reporting Form Sample	28
	d) Reporting Form Responses Data	32
7.0	Acknowledgements	32

1.0 Introduction

a) Project Overview

Beginning on March 30, 2009, Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) implemented new solid waste programs that included more recycling options and food / yard waste collection services to Seattle residents. These new programs were developed and implemented as a result of the City of Seattle's effort to reaching the goal of 60-percent recycling of municipal solid waste (MSW) by the year 2012, and 70-percent by 2025. As of 2008, Seattle recycled 50-percent of its MSW, which saw a modest improvement of nearly 2-percent compared to the year before and nearly a 12-percent increase since 2003 (*Solid Waste 2008 Annual Report*).

The new solid waste rollout included a recycling program that allowed the ability for residents to recycle more items with less sorting in addition to curbside and "beyond the curb" collection services. Meanwhile, approximately 40,000 households received new food waste collection services unless opting out to compost as an alternative. Many customers also received a new garbage, recycling and / or food / yard waste hauler with a new collection day. As a result, many customers may have found increases in rates for respective new solid waste services.

The purpose for this year's partnership between SPU, Environmental Justice Network in Action (EJNA) and local community-based organization (CBO) partners was to communicate, educate and provide solid waste outreach services to residents within Seattle's immigrant and refugee communities. Many of these new changes may have caused confusion and concern to Seattle residents and in particular, the underserved immigrant and refugee communities where many language and cultural barriers to understanding are prevalent.

b) Background and Objectives

Since 2002, the EJNA program has been conducting community-based research and outreach on environmental and environmental health issues in immigrant and refugee communities throughout Seattle and King County. In collaboration with local agency and CBO partners, EJNA's team members (comprised of SPU employees) developed a list of common goals and values that best reflected EJNA's commitment to addressing the environmental and environmental health concerns of its community members. The EJNA program is guided by five goals which include:

- i. Building meaningful, reciprocal relationships with CBOs serving immigrant and refugee communities
- ii. Ensure rate-payer equity and SPU's triple bottom line to all communities
- iii. Build CBO capacity in order to effectively address the community's environmental health concerns on their own
- iv. Continue to ask what the top environmental health and social concerns are in each neighborhood
- v. Continue to find the most effective service delivery methods for community members

The critical need for SPU and EJNA to develop a tailored outreach program to Seattle's underserved communities was clearly identified through recent population estimates with specific indicators of growing immigrant populations particularly in Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, Tagalog and Somali speaking communities.

The *2005 American Community Survey* reported incorporated Seattle had a population of 536,946 people of which the African American, Asian / Pacific Islander and Hispanic / Latino populations made up 29-percent (156,650 people). In addition, recent studies showed that

between April 1, 2000 and July 1, 2007, 82,502 people moved to King County from other countries – making up more than two-thirds of the county’s total growth (122,241 people) during the same time span. City of Seattle Mayor Greg Nickels’ office also reported that nearly 100,000 foreign-born people live in Seattle as indicated from Census 2000 data and trends indicated that as many as 120,000 foreign-born people will be living in Seattle by 2010.

As a result, Mayor Nickels announced steps to improving services to Seattle’s growing immigrant and refugee population by promoting “the full and active participation of immigrant and refugee communities in Seattle’s civic, economic and cultural life” through the City of Seattle’s Race and Social Justice Initiative. Communication, education and outreach of the new solid waste program changes to these growing communities would help to reinforce EJNA’s guiding principles.

Through the strategic partnership, SPU and EJNA have retained our consulting services to document the solid waste outreach to underserved communities conducted by EJNA and respective CBO partners. The end result would be the production of a final report inclusive of all research methodology, presentation summaries, key findings and future outreach recommendations and strategies. More specifically, the solid waste outreach final report strives to accomplish the following goals:

- i. To serve as a comprehensive guide on the solid waste outreach conducted by EJNA and CBO partners
- ii. To summarize all solid waste outreach data including presentations, target audience demographics, effectiveness and evaluations
- iii. To identify key findings based on specific outreach methods, marketing effectiveness and key concerns to the new changes
- iv. To develop recommendations for future outreach methods, targeted audiences, marketing and advertising and presentation delivery and effectiveness ultimately improving overall SPU customer service to immigrant and refugee communities.

c) Key Assumptions

This solid waste outreach final report should take into consideration the following key assumptions and considerations as it relates to the presentation summary, key findings and future outreach recommendations and strategies.

First, a total of 38 presentations were conducted by CBO partners though this report contains data from 36 of those presentations. Two of the presentations were not documented due to scheduling conflicts or unavailability of reporting forms. Within the 36 reports, many of the reporting forms did not capture detailed information or were incomplete. In addition, legibility of several forms was difficult to decipher and thus such responses were indicated as “Not Available” or “Unknown.” These causes may potentially lead to a skewing of data. A complete and consistent capture of all data from one single source or provider for all presentations will maintain the consistency and integrity information collected.

In addition, CBO partners were asked to survey the target audiences with a series of questions towards the end of their presentation. Responses would be documented by the number of hands raised from audience members in response to “Yes”, “No” or multiple choice questions within the survey. The results from the reporting forms showed a significant decline in those that offered responses from the numbers indicated on the attendance sheet suggesting that many of these surveys were not completed by CBO partners. For example, the first survey question asked “Have you heard of these collection services changes prior to today’s presentation?” A total of 242 respondents indicated “Yes”, 264 respondents indicated “No” and there were 93 individual with “No Response.” Adding the sum of responses equaled 599 people, though the total attendance count of the reporting forms totaled 908. This left roughly 34-percent of audience member participation undocumented. Results may have skewed should this have been clearly documented.

This report should also take into consideration that surveys received limited participation from audience members. It should be noted that many presentations seemed to create an intimidating environment for limited English-proficient participants to respond. Audience members did not participate (by raising their hand for any of the questions asked) which may have been a result of translation / language barriers, cultural insensitivity or lack of interest from the audience.

Next, this report assumes that the presentation audience sample was a compilation of CBO partners and their network, combined with our agency's community-based research of outreach opportunities. Several locations that were developed by CBOs may have consisted repeat attendees though the percentages were relatively small – may have produced a minor degree of variation in results.

We do not take into consideration all the emerging immigrant and refugee populations as represented in the Census 2005 population estimates but those that have been advised by SPU EJNA through its CBO partnerships. Thus, several underserved segments within Seattle may have not been represented in this report. Additional funding and time may allow for further in-depth research, presentation outreach and evaluations with more emerging Seattle immigrant and refugee populations in the future.

Finally, this report should also take into consideration that not all presentations were conducted in the same way per CBO partner. A consistent format of presentation delivery would then allow for consistent data when evaluating what were the most effective and ineffective tools for presentations.

2.0 Research Methodology

The EJNA research model is traditionally comprised of the utilization of several collaborative educational, outreach and evaluation methods including any or all of the following: a) presentations, b) field trips, c) focus groups, and d) surveys (*EJNA Needs Assessment 2004-2005*).

In addition, the traditional EJNA research model includes monthly community meetings from February to October where agency partners and EJNA team members present on a number of issues surrounding the environment and environmental health. Field trips are also used as a tool for involving, educating and mobilizing community members about environmental and environmental health issues. Finally, EJNA CBO partners complete focus group discussions in order to gauge and assess community needs and concerns.

For the purposes of this solid waste outreach report, we will focus ONLY on the presentations and its related parts. The following are four segments critical to the development of the solid waste presentations:

- a) Community-Based Organization (CBO) Partners
- b) Presentation Trainings
- c) Presentation Format
- d) Targeted Community-Based Outreach and Locations

a) Community-Based Organizations (CBO) Partners

The EJNA program has utilized partnerships within both local government agency and community-based organizations, which to help to involve, educate, train and organize community members. EJNA selected seven (7) CBO partners for this year's solid waste outreach which included two (2) program leads and two (2) program ambassadors from each

CBO to conduct the outreach presentations. The following are the list of CBOs, brief description of the organization, names of leads and ambassadors and contact information (see Section 6.0.a under APPENDIX for the complete CBO Roster):

Asian & Pacific Islander Women & Family Safety Center (APIWFSC)

The mission of the APIWFSC is to organize communities, educate, train, and provide technical assistance and comprehensive culturally relevant services on domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking to Asian and Pacific Islander community members, service providers, survivors, and their families.

Contact: Asian & Pacific Islander Women & Family Safety Center
P.O. Box 14047
Seattle, WA 98114
Leads: Emma Catague and Mey Saelee
Ambassadors: Emerita Gaviola and Dado Saturay
Telephone: 206.467.9976

Horn of Africa Services (HOAS)

HOAS is a multi-lingual, multicultural nonprofit organization offering individual and family counseling and referral services. HOAS responds to the health, employment, housing and educational needs within communities from Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan, and neighboring countries who are living in the Greater Seattle area. HOAS provides services by bilingual staff speaking in Amharic, Oromo, Tigrigna, and Somali.

Contact: Horn of Africa Services
4714 Rainier Ave S, Ste 105
Seattle, WA 98118
Leads: Tsegaye Gebru and Tigist Teshome
Ambassadors: Lulit Merio and Ethiopia Alemneh
Telephone: 206.760.0550

International District Housing Alliance (IDHA)

For more than 30 years the IDHA has worked to improve the quality of life for Chinatown-International District residents and Asian and Pacific Islanders (API) of greater Seattle by providing community-building and housing-related services to low-income individuals and families. IDHA remains the only organization that provides multi-lingual, culturally competent affordable housing support and community-building services to Seattle's API communities.

Contact: International District Housing Alliance
606 Maynard Ave S, Ste 105
Seattle, WA 98104
Leads: Casey China and Quyet Huynh
Ambassadors: Jian Qing Zhao and Shumin Lin
Telephone: 206.623.5132

Khmer Community of Seattle / King County (KCSKC)

The mission of KCSKC is to organize, educate, train, and provide technical assistance and culturally relevant services the Cambodian community of Seattle and King County.

Contact: Khmer Community of Seattle / King County
10025 16th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98146
Leads: Thuong Thanh and Khydar Musa
Ambassadors: Kimsan Tong and Touch Young
Telephone: 206.762.3922

Pasefika

The mission of Pasefika is to organize, educate, train and provide culturally relevant services to the Hawaiian, Samoan and Pacific Islander community within King County.

Contact: Pasefika
10237 16th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98146
Lead: Doris Tevaseu
Ambassador: Glenn Leituala
Telephone: 206.762.3922

Somali Community Services of Seattle (SCSS)

The SCSS is a community-based service organization whose mission is to work for the success of the refugees to undergo a smooth transitional process and attain a self-sustaining status in Seattle and the United States.

Contact: Somali Community Services of Seattle
3320 Rainier Ave S
Seattle, WA 98144
Leads: Farhiya Mohamend and Farah Sarah
Ambassador: Baroon Ahmed
Telephone: 206.760.1181

St. Mary's Church

St. Mary's is a faith-based organization that offers weekly mass and programs for its membership primarily in the African American and Hispanic / Latino populations. St. Mary's also offers a weekly food bank.

Contact: St. Mary's Church
611 20th Ave S
Seattle, WA 98144
Leads: Isom Taylor and Lupita Zamora
Ambassadors: Ana Zeek and Noel Younger
Telephone: 206.324.7100

b) Presentation Trainings

As the March 30 rollout approached, the CBO partners prepared for their education and outreach by attending a series of trainings and workshops led by SPU and EJNA. These trainings consisted of all the new solid waste programs and changes to garbage, recycle and food /yard waste policies with each training session focused on a specific program. Several trainings also included printed materials, handouts, worksheets, props and displays in an effort to visually communicate the respective changes of the solid waste programs. There were a total of five workshops in all scheduled between the end of January to the end of March with each lasting two hours (the third training concluded with a field trip to Cedar Grove in Everett). Each of the seven (7) CBOs and respective leads and ambassadors were required to attend all five trainings in order to be prepared for the community outreach and education beginning in April. The following was the training schedule, topics and respective training materials used in preparation for the March 30 rollout:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Trainer</u>	<u>Print Materials or Displays</u>
1/29	2100 Building	6-8PM	Orientation Presentation Brainstorm	EJNA Staff	"Where Does It Go" Flyer Curb Waste & Conserve Newsletter Solid Waste Calendar
2/12	2100 Building	6-8PM	Recycling	Marcia Rutan	"Where Does It Go" Flyer Curb Waste & Conserve Solid Waste Calendar Recycling Poster Foam Core
2/28	2100 Building Cedar Grove	10A-12P 1-3PM	Food Waste Field Trip	Marcia Rutan EJNA Staff	"Where Does It Go" Flyer Curb Waste & Conserve Solid Waste Calendar Food Storage Containers Bio Bags Food / Waste Poster Foam Core
3/10	2100 Building	6-8PM	Special Waste & Garbage	Marcia Rutan	"Where Does It Go" Flyer Curb Waste & Conserve Solid Waste Calendar "Take It Back" Brochures Household Hazardous Waste Materials / Samples Garbage Poster Foam Core
3/24	2100 Building	6-8PM	Practice	EJNA Staff	All Presentation Materials

Lastly, each of the CBO partners were scheduled to provide education staffing and support to the SPU tradeshow booth at the Green Festival in Seattle, held at the Washington State Convention Center on March 28-29, 2009. The Green Festival hosted thousands of individuals, community organizations, non-profits and companies from throughout Western Washington to learn about the latest green products and services available in the Pacific Northwest. This allowed for CBO partners to apply what they learned from the workshops to a real environment with tradeshow attendees to further prepare themselves for live presentations beginning in April.

c) Presentation Format

The suggested presentation format consisted of community education on each of the following components of the new solid waste program: 1) recycling, 2) food / yard waste, 3) garbage, 4) other collection services, 5) other recycling & disposal options or "beyond the curb," and 6) household hazardous waste. The second half of the presentation was allotted to question and clarification from the audience. The final portion of the presentation was dedicated to surveying from the audience.

Each CBO received a "presentation kit" which included flyers (both in English and in-language as necessary), brochures, visual samples of each of the solid waste programs and an interactive display board. In addition, EJNA staff produced a script of important solid waste changes and highlights for CBO partners to assist in the facilitation of the presentation. All materials were produced to support a presentation format that was intended to be 60 minutes including presentation and question / answer from the community. However, the presentation was also designed to be flexible due to surrounding environment, conditions and circumstances (i.e. time allotted, presentation location and space, appropriateness for audience, etc).

SPU and EJNA staff recommended that a combination of three (3) members from each CBO participate in the presentations to communities. The role of the CBO lead was to conduct the presentation, while the other two (2) members (either a lead and / or one or two ambassadors) assisted with presentation display, distributed handouts, documented notes and photographed the sessions.

EJNA staff strongly encouraged CBO partners to prepare and practice the presentations prior to their initial live presentations beginning in April. In addition, EJNA staff encouraged CBO partners to find a comfortable method that was most suitable to their presentation style and flow, and deemed most appropriate for their respective immigrant and refugee communities. As a result, several CBOs (HOAS and IDHA) decided to develop their own PowerPoint presentations to further assist and illustrate the new solid waste programs. In addition, other CBOs (APIWFSC and KCSKC) provided their own physical samples of recyclable materials commonly used in their ethnic cultures to better illustrate solid waste items.

d) Targeted Community-Based Outreach and Locations

Recent population and demographics data in Seattle revealed the increasing growth within immigrating immigrant and refugee communities. These communities included many from within the Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, Tagalog and Somali speaking populations. The strategic partnerships with selected CBOs were critical in developing the list of relevant presentation locations and outreach.

The goal of the presentations were to communicate, educate and provide outreach services to as many households within these emerging communities impacted by the changes to the solid waste services. This narrowed our outreach search to those that were Seattle residents only. Secondly, the changes applied only to those that lived in a single-family home (or duplex, townhome, etc) or multi-family dwelling (i.e. apartment or condominium). Those that lived in Seattle Housing Authority units or government-subsidized housing would not qualify for the new solid waste programs since these complexes did not receive service from SPU.

Based upon EJNA outreach programs in previous years, results indicated that a "classroom style" presentation may work more effectively within regularly scheduled community meetings and / or gatherings. This would allow for less extensive recruitment efforts on behalf of the CBO partners since many of the targeted audiences would be present at these regularly scheduled meetings. In addition, should the new solid waste programs be able to tie into the regularly scheduled programming, the education and outreach would be seen as more relevant to those that attended the presentation. Thus, it was important to identify presentation opportunities that could benefit from these scenarios.

With these factors in mind, our agency conducted a brainstorm session with each of the CBO partners on the January 29 workshop training on potential presentation location opportunities within each of the CBO communities, respectively. EJNA also provided a list of CBO presentations opportunities developed through a 2007 brainstorm session for each of the respective communities. A follow-up meeting was scheduled with each of the CBO partners to confirm and solidify presentation locations. Finally, a working list of presentations was produced and presented to SPU (see *Section 6.0.b Presentation Schedule under APPENDIX*).

3.0 Presentations Summary

a) Presentations Overview

The goal of the developed work plan between EJNA and respective CBO partners scheduled for six (6) presentations to be completed by each CBO between April and June of 2009, totaling 42 presentations in all.

As of July 9, 2009 the combined CBO partners were able to complete a total of 38 presentations. Two (2) presentations were scheduled with conflicts, one (1) presentation was unattended and one (1) presentation was unscheduled. The following is a list of total presentation attendance per CBO, percentage of total attendance, as well as the average size per presentation documented:

<u>CBO Partner</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Location</u>
<u>APIWFSC</u>	4/7	Tuesday Senior Luncheon	Filipino Community Center
Doc Total: 6	4/23	Thursday Senior Luncheon	Filipino Community Center
Total #: 263	5/9	Citizenship Potluck	Filipino Community Center
%Total: 29.0	5/20	Hmong / Mien Luncheon	Filipino Community Center
Avg #: 43.8	6/5	Lao Highland Luncheon	Filipino Community Center
	6/6	Parenting and Youth Program	Lao Highland Association
<u>HOAS</u>	4/9	Youth Program	Medhane-Alem Evangelical
Doc Total: 6	4/12	Women's Program Meeting	Medhane-Alem Evangelical
Total #: 122	5/2	Workshop	National Union of Eritreans
%Total: 13.4	5/15	Computer Training Class	Horn of Africa Services
Avg #: 20.3	6/21	Workshop	Rhoboth Ethiopian Church
	6/28	Coffee Hour Program	Medhane-Alem Evangelical
<u>IDHA</u>	4/29	Community Resident Meeting	IDHA
Doc Total: 5	5/6	South Beacon Hill Neighborhood	St. Mark's Lutheran Church
Total #: 69	5/20	ESL Program	ID / Chinatown Comm Center
%Total: 7.6	6/1	Composting Club Luncheon	Garfield High School
Avg #: 13.8	6/17	Teen Advisory Meeting	Jefferson Community Center
	6/19	Family Center / ESL Class	Chinese Info Service Center
<u>KCSKC</u>	4/4	Cambodian New Year Luncheon	KCSKC Offices
Doc Total: 5	4/25	Citizenship Class	KCSKC Offices
Total #: 98	5/9	Youth Program	KCSKC Offices
%Total: 10.8	5/23	Senior Companion Program	KCSKC Offices
Avg #: 19.6	6/13	Computer Education Class	KCSKC Offices
	6/27	Cambodian Language Program	KCSKC Offices
<u>Pasefika</u>	4/23	Intermediate ESL Program	SW Youth & Family Services
Doc Total: 3	6/9	Asset Youth Group / Promoting Assets	Safe Futures Youth Center
Total #: 52	6/9	Parent Group – Immigrant / Refugee	Safe Futures Youth Center
%Total: 5.7			
Avg #: 17.3			
<u>SCSS</u>	4/4	Parents of Young Children Program	Refugee Women's Alliance
Doc Total: 6	4/8	East African Senior Luncheon	Rainier Community Center
Total #: 177	5/2	Saturday Nutrition Program	SCSS Offices
%Total: 19.5	5/22	Bilingual School	Brighton Apartments
Avg #: 29.5	5/22	Senior Luncheon	International Drop-In Center
	6/26	Senior Luncheon	Refugee Women's Alliance
<u>St. Mary's</u>	4/14	Neighborhood Block Watch	Douglas Truth Seattle Library
Doc Total: 5	4/26	Coffee Hour – General	St. Mary's Church
Total #: 127	4/26	Coffee Hour – Spanish	St. Mary's Church
%Total: 14.0	5/5	ESL and Citizenship Program	El Centro de la Raza
Avg #: 25.4	7/1	Food Empowerment Education	Youngstown Cultural Art Center

Overall Number of CBO Presentation Goal:	42
Overall Number of CBO Presentations Actual:	38
Overall Number of CBO Presentations Documented:	36
Overall Number of Attendees / Households Goal (42 presentations):	840
Overall Number of Attendees / Households Documented:	908
Overall Average # of Households per Presentation Goal:	20.0
Overall Average # of Households per Presentation Documented:	25.2
Overall Average Number of Household Size:	3.26
Estimated Overall Number of Direct Reach:	2,960

For detailed presentation schedule data, please refer Section 6.0.b Presentation Schedule under APPENDIX.

b) Audience Demographics

The following is a summary of all documented audience demographic who attended the CBO partner presentations from April 1 through July 1, 2009. Please note that the following data does not include two (2) presentations (of a total of 38 presentations held) due to incomplete or lack of reporting forms:

RACE

<u>Race</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Asian / Pacific Islander:	496	54.6
African American / East African:	279	30.7
Hispanic / Latino:	83	9.1
White:	13	1.4
Mixed Race:	8	0.9
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>3.2</u>
TOTAL	908	100%

ETHNICITY

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>% of Group</u>
Filipino:	157	17.3	31.7
Somali	134	14.8	48.0
Cambodian:	121	13.3	24.4
Mien:	74	8.1	14.9
Chinese:	56	6.2	11.3
Ethiopian:	55	6.1	19.7
Latino	36	4.0	43.4
Vietnamese:	34	3.7	6.9
Amharic:	31	3.4	11.1
Mexican	27	3.0	32.5
Laos:	23	2.5	4.6
Hmong:	19	2.1	3.8
Other:	83	9.1	9.1
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>3.2</u>
TOTAL	908	100%	100%

Note: A total of 27 ethnicities were identified through the reporting forms documentation.

LANGUAGE

<u>CBO Interpretation Needed</u>	<u># Yes</u>	<u># No</u>	<u>N/A Unknown</u>
APIWFSC:	6	0	0
HOAS:	4	1	1
IDHA:	3	1	1
KCSKC:	3	2	1
Pasefika:	1	2	1
SCCC:	4	0	2
<u>St. Mary's:</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	23	9	6
PERCENTAGE % OF TOTAL	60.5	23.7	15.8

Total # Needing Interpretation: 703
 Percentage of Total # Needing Interpretation: 77.4%
 Average Size of Presentation Needing Interpretation: 30.6

<u>Interpretation Language</u>	<u># of Times</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Cambodian:	3	13.1
Tagalog:	3	13.1
Cantonese:	2	8.6
Ethiopian:	2	8.7
Spanish:	2	8.7
Amharic:	1	4.4
Mien:	1	4.4
Somali:	1	4.4
Vietnamese:	1	4.4
Multiple: Cambodian & Vietnamese:	1	4.4
Multiple: Cantonese & Tagalog:	1	4.4
Multiple: Laos & Mien:	1	4.4
Multiple: Laos, Mien & Hmong:	1	4.4
Multiple: Amharic & Oromo:	1	4.4
<u>Multiple: Ethiopian & Oromo:</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4.4</u>
TOTAL	23	100%

Note: A total of 12 languages were identified needed for interpretation during presentations.

ZIP CODES

AFRICAN-AMERICAN / EAST AFRICAN		
<u>Zip Code</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Group</u>
98118 (S Beacon Hill, Rainier Beach):	68	24.4
98108 (Beacon Hill):	25	9.0
98144 (Beacon Hill, N Rainier):	16	5.7
98104 (Int'l District, First Hill):	15	5.4
98133 (Greenwood, Broadview):	15	5.4
98168 (Georgetown):	14	5.0
98126 (White Center, Highpoint):	11	3.9
98122 (Central District):	10	3.6
98125 (Lake City):	10	3.6
Other:	71	25.4
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>8.9</u>
TOTAL	279	100%

ASIAN / PACIFIC ISLANDER

<u>Zip Code</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Group</u>
98118 (S Beacon Hill, Rainier Beach):	115	23.2
98104 (Int'l District, First Hill):	57	11.5
98108 (Beacon Hill):	49	9.9
98106 (White Center, Delridge):	45	9.1
98178 (Skyway):	31	6.3
98126 (White Center, Highpoint):	21	4.2
98168 (Georgetown):	17	3.4
98144 (Beacon Hill, N Rainier):	16	3.4
98146 (Burien, Highline):	16	3.4
Other:	73	14.7
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>11.3</u>
TOTAL	496	100%

HISPANIC / LATINO

<u>Zip Code</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Group</u>
98144 (Beacon Hill, N Rainier):	23	27.7
98118 (S Beacon Hill, Rainier Beach):	16	19.3
98122 (Central District):	8	9.6
98108 (Beacon Hill):	7	8.4
98146 (Burien, Highline):	7	8.4
98188 (Seatac):	5	6.0
Other:	17	20.5
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	83	100%

WHITE

<u>Zip Code</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Group</u>
98103 (Wallingford):	4	30.8
98106 (White Center, Delridge):	2	15.4
98144 (Beacon Hill, N Rainier):	2	15.4
98108 (Beacon Hill):	1	7.7
98118 (S Beacon Hill, Rainier Beach):	1	7.7
98133 (Greenwood, Broadview):	1	7.7
98146 (Burien, Highline):	1	7.7
Other:	0	0.0
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	13	100%

MIXED RACE

<u>Zip Code</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Group</u>
98106 (include area):	4	50.0
98102 (Eastlake, Capitol Hill):	1	12.5
98104 (Int'l District, First Hill):	1	12.5
98118 (S Beacon Hill, Rainier Beach):	1	12.5
98126 (White Center, Highpoint):	1	12.5
Other:	0	0.0
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	83	100%

OVERALL – NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS

<u>Zip Code</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
98118 (S Beacon Hill, Rainier Beach):	202	22.2
98108 (Beacon Hill):	82	9.0
98104 (Int'l District, First Hill):	73	8.0
98106 (White Center, Delridge):	66	7.3
98144 (Beacon Hill, N Rainier):	59	6.5
98178 (Skyway):	39	4.3
98122 (Central District):	35	3.9
98126 (White Center, Highpoint):	34	3.7
98168 (Georgetown):	31	3.4
98146 (Burien, Highline):	28	3.1
98133 (Greenwood, Broadview):	21	2.3
98056 (Renton):	13	1.4
98125 (Lake City):	13	1.4
98188 (Seatac):	13	1.4
98031 (Kent):	10	1.1
Other:	108	11.9
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>8.9</u>
TOTAL	908	100%

OVERALL – SUM OF HOUSEHOLDS

<u>Zip Code</u>	<u>Sum of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
98118 (S Beacon Hill, Rainier Beach):	593	22.0
98108 (Beacon Hill):	296	11.0
98106 (White Center, Delridge):	223	8.3
98144 (Beacon Hill, N Rainier):	217	8.1
98178 (Skyway):	190	7.1
98168 (Georgetown):	128	4.8
98104 (Int'l District, First Hill):	123	4.6
98126 (White Center, Highpoint):	121	4.5
98122 (Central District):	98	3.6
98146 (Burien, Highline):	88	3.3
98133 (Greenwood, Broadview):	72	2.7
98031 (Kent):	45	1.7
98056 (Renton):	45	1.7
98125 (Lake City):	39	1.5
98188 (Seatac):	36	1.3
Other:	296	11.0
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>8.9</u>
TOTAL	2,691	100%

HOUSEHOLD SIZE

<u>Household Size</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
1:	172	18.9
2:	196	21.6
3:	145	16.0
4:	109	12.0
5:	92	10.1
6:	46	5.1
7:	38	4.2
8:	8	0.9

9:	5	0.6
10:	11	1.2
11:	2	0.2
12:	0	0.0
13:	1	0.1
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>8.9</u>
TOTAL	908	100%

<u>Race</u>	<u>Average HH Size</u>
Hispanic:	3.94
Asian / Pacific Islander:	3.27
Mixed Race:	3.13
African American / East African:	3.12
White:	3.00
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>3.45</u>
TOTAL	3.26

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Average HH Size</u>
Hmong:	5.94
Mexican	4.19
Mien:	4.15
Amharic:	3.90
Latino	3.50
Vietnamese:	3.50
Laos:	3.30
Somali	3.29
Cambodian:	2.97
Filipino:	2.75
Ethiopian:	2.69
Chinese:	2.07
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>3.45</u>
TOTAL	3.26

HOUSEHOLD TYPE

<u>APIWFSC Household Type</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Multi-Family Dwelling	85	32.3
Single-Family Home	158	60.1
Government Housing	10	3.8
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3.8</u>
TOTAL	263	100%

<u>HOAS Household Type</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Multi-Family Dwelling	79	64.8
Single-Family Home	24	19.7
Government Housing	0	0.0
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>15.6</u>
TOTAL	122	100%

IDHA		
<u>Household Type</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Multi-Family Dwelling	54	78.3
Single-Family Home	13	18.8
Government Housing	2	2.9
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	69	100%

KCSKC		
<u>Household Type</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Multi-Family Dwelling	20	20.4
Single-Family Home	66	67.3
Government Housing	12	12.2
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
TOTAL	98	100%

PASEFIKA		
<u>Household Type</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Multi-Family Dwelling	27	51.9
Single-Family Home	19	36.5
Government Housing	5	9.6
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.9</u>
TOTAL	52	100%

SCSS		
<u>Household Type</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Multi-Family Dwelling	73	41.2
Single-Family Home	46	26.0
Government Housing	6	3.4
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>29.4</u>
TOTAL	177	100%

ST. MARY'S		
<u>Household Type</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Multi-Family Dwelling	69	54.3
Single-Family Home	52	40.9
Government Housing	3	2.4
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2.4</u>
TOTAL	127	100%

OVERALL		
<u>Household Type</u>	<u># of Households</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Multi-Family Dwelling	407	44.8
Single-Family Home	378	41.6
Government Housing	38	4.2
<u>Not Available / Unknown:</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>9.4</u>
TOTAL	908	100%

c) Audience Evaluation Responses

The following is a summary of all documented audience evaluations and responses who attended the CBO partner presentations from April 1 through July 1, 2009. Please note that though the following data does not include two (2) presentations due to the lack of reporting forms, it also includes a relatively large amount of non-participation from target audiences and thus may potentially skew the data. Of the 908 audience members recorded, consistency in respondents was not accurately captured. An estimated 64-percent of those attended provided responses to the question in the following:

PROGRAM AWARENESS

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Non-Response</u>
Have heard about program changes prior?	242	264	93
Percentage of the Sample # (599):	40.4%	44.1%	15.5%

AWARENESS METHOD

	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Radio</u>	<u>TV</u>	<u>Bus</u>	<u>Newspr</u>	<u>Comm</u>	<u>Mouth</u>	<u>Web</u>	<u>N-R</u>
If yes, what method?	72	20	39	12	13	33	22	11	377
% of Yes Sample	29.8%	8.3%	16.1%	5.0%	5.4%	13.6%	9.1%	4.5%	
% of Total Sample	12.0%	3.3%	6.5%	2.0%	2.2%	5.5%	3.7%	1.8%	62.9%

PROGRAM UNDERSTANDING

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Non-Response</u>
Understand changes to collection services?	457	0	121
Percentage of Sample # (578):	79.1%	0.0%	20.9%

INFORMATION SHARING

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Non-Response</u>
Willing to share the information with others?	410	0	159
Percentage of Sample # (569):	72.1%	0.0%	27.9%

COMMON QUESTIONS & CONCERNS

	<u># of Times</u>	<u>% of All</u>
Specific questions related to what is recyclable / non recyclable?	14	30.0%
Program changes area of eligibility?	8	17.0
Cost of new program services?	6	13.0
Food / compost bin information?	6	13.0
Physical bin related questions?	6	13.0
Where to get bio-bags?	3	6.0
Collection services information?	2	4.0
Penalty for not recycling or adhering to new rules?	2	4.0

TOPICS OF COMMENTS

	<u># of Times</u>	<u>% of All</u>
Recycling-related comments	10	28.0%
Presentation educated audience	8	22.0
Need more contact information for questions and comments	6	14.0
Need more education and outreach opportunities	4	11.0
Audience will share information	3	8.0
Translated materials	2	6.0

d) CBO Evaluation Responses

The following is a summary of all documented CBO partner evaluations and responses who lead the presentations from April 1 through July 1, 2009. Please note that the following data does not include two (2) presentations due to the lack of reporting forms:

SOLID WASTE TRAINING

Please note the following rating criteria:

(1-not helpful, 2-somewhat helpful, 3-helpful, 4-very helpful)

<u>How helpful was the training preparation?</u>	<u>Average Response</u>
APIWFSC	3.67
HOAS	3.25
IDHA	3.50
KCSKC	3.60
Pasefika	2.75
SCSS	4.00
St. Mary's	3.60
TOTAL	3.53

EFFECTIVE PRESENTATION TOOLS

<u>What were the most effective presentation tools?</u>	<u># of Times</u>	<u>% of All</u>
Display Board	19	52.8%
"Where Does It Go" Flyer	19	52.8
Physical Display Items	14	38.9
PowerPoint	4	11.1
Visual Displays (General)	3	8.3
Interactive Activities	2	5.6
Video	1	2.8

INEFFECTIVE PRESENTATION TOOLS

<u>What were the most ineffective presentation tools?</u>	<u># of Times</u>	<u>% of All</u>
Supplemental Handouts	10	27.8
Demographic / Logistics	7	19.4
Display Board	5	13.9
Bins	2	5.6

PRESENTATION LOGISTICS

<u>What would change about presentation logistic?</u>	<u># of Times</u>	<u>% of All</u>
Room / Space Availability	8	22.2
Time Concerns	8	22.2
Audience Concerns	7	19.4
Presentation-Specific Comments	5	13.9
Preparedness for Presentation	5	13.9

PRESENTATION FORMAT

<u>What would change about presentation format?</u>	<u># of Times</u>	<u>% of All</u>
Handouts / Brochures	12	33.3
Attendee Participation	9	25.0
Presentation Layout / Order	8	22.2
Presenters	6	16.7
More Visuals	6	16.7
Additional Presentation Components	4	11.1
Presentation Giveaways	3	8.3
Event Opportunities	2	5.6
Provide More Information	2	5.6

4.0 Summary of Key Findings

The SPU EJNA and CBO partner new solid waste program education and outreach to the underserved communities provided valuable insights to the impact of communication and education to immigrant and refugee segments within Seattle. Documentation of the EJNA model, partner trainings, outreach efforts and data collection produced several key findings of which are indicated by category in the following:

- a) Outreach Method
- b) Marketing Effectiveness
- c) Presentation Delivery Type and Delivery
- d) Target Audience Concerns

a) Outreach Method

The SPU EJNA training model selected the use of community presentations as type of education and outreach for the new solid waste programs.

Many presentations solidified through the outreach to respective communities relied heavily on CBO partners and their existing programs or locations. For the exception of Pasefika, each of the CBO partners utilized either their current existing space and / or programs for at least one (1) presentation. This was significantly evident through CBO partners APIWFSC, HOAS and KCSKC. All six presentations with the Cambodian communities were held at the KCSKC offices located in White Center. Five (5) of the six (6) presentations conducted by APIWFSC were held at the Filipino Community Center in the Rainier Valley. Half of all the presentations for HOAS were conducted at the Medhane-Alem Evangelical Church in the Rainier Valley.

In addition, many CBO partners identified other community programs within their network that would help to compliment their current list of presentations. Our agency followed-up with many of these presentation opportunities scheduling presentations to fit existing programs and audience deemed appropriate for respective CBOs. Other outreach for presentation opportunities were developed through partner our agency's research of community-based programs that would target the desired demographics – mostly within the immigrant and refugee communities. This included outreach to community luncheons, ESL programs, family and parenting classes, neighborhood community meetings and computer training workshops. Roughly one-third (33-percent) of all presentations were centered around luncheon or nutrition related programs.

CBO partners nearly accomplished the total presentation number goal by completing 38 presentations total between April 1 – July 1, 2009 – four (4) shy of the target mark. The remaining presentations that were not completed due to scheduling conflicts, presentation cancellations or lack of attendance by either the CBO partner or audience. The CBO partners

however were able to meet the participation goals by having an average of 25.2 people, representing individual households, per presentation – an average of five (5) people / household more per presentation than anticipated. Four (4) CBOs reached a participation average above 20 people:

- 1) APIWFSC – 43.8 people / households per presentation (six presentations total)
- 2) SCSS – 29.5 people / households per presentation (six presentations total)
- 3) St. Mary's – 25.4 people / households per presentation (five presentations total)
- 4) HOAS – 20.3 people / households per presentation (six presentations total)

Note: For complete list of CBO participation averages, please refer to Section 3.0.a under Presentation Overview.

These results indicate the overall presentation outreach was moderately effective given the particular locations and programs chosen.

The largest challenge for presentation outreach method was clearly logistics and scheduling. Strategically scheduling solid waste presentations within current existing community programs proved to be difficult as many of the presentation opportunities did not match with CBO partner schedules and availability. In addition, variable presentations times and locations were dependent on audience participation and available topics which presented additional scheduling issues.

Pasefika, who did not have paid or dedicated staff at their respective organization, had particularly difficulty scheduling presentations since the organization lead and ambassador both had other full-time occupations. This limited Pasefika outreach opportunities to occur only during select evenings of the week which made locating presentation opportunities extremely challenging. These were obstacles even though SPU EJNA provided compensation to each of the respective CBO partners for completed projects and goals. As a result Pasefika was only able to complete three (3) presentations total having received credit for an additional fourth presentation based on a cancellation.

In addition, the criteria for which the selected outreach and presentations occurred made it especially challenging for Pasefika, with most of their respective community members located within the White Center unincorporated King County area. Since SPU did not service many of Pasefika's community stakeholders, utilizing their programs and network were not as useful as other CBO partners.

Other challenges included the potential duplication of audience members for respective CBOs. Since many of the above mentioned CBOs presented at very few locations (KCSKC, APIWFSC and HOAS), this could have potentially recruited audience members to attend multiple presentations though the programs at each of these locations differed. However, this cannot be verified through the reporting forms and documentation.

b) Marketing Effectiveness

Marketing effectiveness for the new solid waste program was measured by the surveying of audience members at the conclusion of respective presentations. CBO partners were instructed to ask a series of questions including program awareness, how they learned about the changes and whether or not they would be willing to share the changes with others. Members from the audience were recorded by the number of hands that were raised in response to each of the questions.

Results showed that 44-percent of the audience had not heard about these program changes prior to the presentations. This relatively low number was largely unexpected since outreach and education efforts were based on the assumptions of respective communities' lack of

awareness due to limited in-language materials and access to traditional marketing methods utilized to promote the new solid waste changes.

The surveys also indicated audience members that knew about program changes came in roughly at 40-percent and the total of non-responses amounted to 16-percent. Surveys also indicated that the most effective sources for program awareness were through mail, television advertising and community either through events or organizations. The following are respondent results (for those that indicated having awareness of the program prior to presentation):

- 1) Mail – 72 respondents 29.8%
- 2) TV – 39 respondents or 16.1%
- 3) Community – 33 respondents or 13.6%
- 4) Word of Mouth – 22 respondents or 9.1%
- 5) Radio – 20 respondents or 8.3%
- 6) Newspaper – 13 respondents or 5.4%
- 7) Bus Billboard – 12 respondents or 5.0%
- 8) Website – 11 respondents or 4.5%

In addition, the surveys also indicate an overwhelming percentage of audience members willing to share the new program changes with others at 72-percent (410 respondents). No presentations documented any audience members indicating “no” to this question though roughly 28-percent (159 people) did not respond.

Though the surveys produce several key findings on marketing effectiveness, we must keep in mind that the data collected may be skewed since a large majority of audience members did not raise their hands or participate. Attendance records show that 908 members signed in for the 36 presentations documented by reporting forms. However, only a total of 599 respondents were accounted for during the surveying which leaves 309 or 34-percent unaccounted for during surveys.

Several reasons could indicate why this occurred. First, many presentations did not conduct the surveys since there was either not enough time or the CBO partner had forgotten to ask the questions. Secondly, in-language presentations and interpretation could have made surveying comprehension difficult for audience members. Thirdly, audience members may have shown a lack of interest since the surveying occurred at the end of each presentation and thus many had been sitting for a long duration before having a chance to respond. Lastly, asking audience members to raise their hands may have conflicted against the audience member’s level of comfort given lack of cultural sensitivity thus possibly being a reason as to not raising their hands in response. Audience member may have felt as if they were signing up for something that they did not necessarily want.

c) Presentation Delivery

At the end of each presentation, the CBOs was asked to provide feedback including preparation, presentation tool effectiveness and presentation logistics and format. Overall, CBO partners rated the SPU EJNA trainings at a 3.53 out of a maximum possibility of 4.00, classifying the workshops as the midpoint between helpful and very helpful.

SCSS rated the EJNA trainings at a perfect score of 4.00 for all presentations while APIWFSC, KSCKC, St. Mary’s and IDHA all rated 3.50 or higher. The CBO partner that rated the EJNA trainings lowest was Pasefika which came in at an average of 2.75. The following is a average responses of CBOs from high to low in helpfulness:

- 1) SCSS – 4.00
- 2) APIWFSC – 3.67
- 3) KSCKC – 3.60

- 4) St. Mary's – 3.60
- 5) IDHA – 3.50
- 6) HOAS – 3.25
- 7) Pasefika – 2.75

The most effective presentation tools determined by the CBO partners were the display board and in-language "Where Does It Go Flyers" with 19 mentions (53-percent of presentations). Physical displays for were also noted as an effective presentation tool at 14 mentions (39-percent) while PowerPoint presentations were also noted by select CBOs that utilized the tool (4 mentions and 11-percent).

The least effective presentation tools were supplemental handouts that were either not reviewed during the presentation or not handed out all together. This tool was mentioned 10 times (28-percent). In addition, the logistics, presentation layout and / or audience demographic was also indicated as ineffective for the presentation with seven (7) mentions (19-percent). Display boards were also mentioned as ineffective five (5) times (14-percent) possibly due to the presentation layout and thus was not utilized.

CBO partners also provided feedback on the presentation format indicating the supplemental handouts and "Where Does It Go?" flyer as the major portion of the presentation they would change, largely due to the lack of in-language translations available to the communities. This was indicated 12 times or 33-percent of all presentations. Other presentation format elements that CBOs would change include attendee participation and presentation layout mentioned nine (9) times and eight (8) times, respectively.

For complete CBO evaluations, please see Section 3.0.d under CBO Evaluation Responses.

The overall presentation delivery of new solid waste programs was widely successful to the targeted audiences. 79-percent of all presentation audiences indicated they understood the changes to collection services. No individuals indicated to not understanding and the remaining 21-percent did not respond.

d) Target Audience Concerns

Community members from the target audiences had a wide-ranging of questions throughout the various presentations. The most often asked question related to what materials were recyclable with 14 presentations having CBO partners answer individual questions related to various materials (30-percent of all presentation). Other frequently asked questions included areas of eligibility, cost of new services, food / yard waste related information and actual physical bins.

One of the primary concerns of the target audience centered on the food waste composting requirement and not being able to accept plastic bags for the participants' fear of unsanitary conditions and inconvenience. The alternatives suggested through utilization of a plastic food waste container or freezer storage until collection days did not offer strong resolutions. Biodegradable bags were acceptable options for many of the concerned audience members until learning about extra costs associated to the bags. In addition, many presenters were not ready to answer questions on where to purchase the bio-bags. Compliance for food waste compost will continue to be a challenge moving forward.

Though questions related to price and cost were not as frequently asked (13-percent), the inability of CBO partners to provide definite answers caused uneasiness in several of the presentations. It should be noted that for several presentations, cost played a role in association to audience acceptance of the new programs as several community members argued the purpose for these changes if they were going to increase rates.

Overall, CBO partners were able to answer many of the audience questions and addressed the majority of their concerns. However, it should also be noted that several presentations did not have any audience members ask any questions. This may have been associated to difficulties in the understanding and comprehension of the presentation due to language barriers and or simply lack of interest from the target audience. Poor documentation of the presentation may also be another reason for the limited number of questions raised by the audience.

5.0 Future Outreach Recommendations and Strategies

The SPU EJNA solid waste communication, education and outreach to underserved communities provided very useful feedback and insights to effective outreach and marketing methods, target audience receptiveness and appropriate delivery of information. The program also developed community partnerships and presented future opportunities for outreach and education. Documentation of such outreach revealed several important implications or recommendations of how SPU should market and outreach to immigrant and refugee communities in the future. In the following are several of these recommendations:

a) Outreach Method for Targeted Audiences

The following recommended outreach methods pertain to the specific target audiences identified in the following:

African American / East African Communities

The African American / East African communities represented nearly a third of the entire presentation sample (31-percent) which exceeds Seattle's overall emerging population estimates. The success of reaching this growing demographic is a result of the strong partnerships between SPU EJNA and community based organizations including HOAS and SCSS. Both organizations have organizational staff (though limited in capacity) and community-based programs with a consistent client base.

The top three African American / East African ethnic groups that participated were Somali, Ethiopian and Amharic. The Somali population was the second largest ethnic group in the program totaling 15-percent of the entire presentation sample and representing nearly half of the entire racial category (134 households). The majority of recruitment and outreach for the Somali community was the result of the SCSS network and their recruitment efforts. The Ethiopian community, mostly recruited by HOAS had the sixth highest number of participants overall with 55 households representing nearly 20-percent of the entire African American / East African group.

Our study shows the current method of outreach by utilizing current existing CBO partnerships with SCSS and HOAS to target African American / East African communities as successful. We recommend a continued partnership between SPU EJNA and HOAS and SCSS for community-based outreach to these immigrant and refugee segments. Additionally, we recommend SPU explore a potential strategic partnership with Refugee Women's Alliance as it has a strong connection to immigrant and refugee communities specifically with East African communities.

For more information on the breakdown of ethnicity, see Section 3.0.b under ETHNICITY.

Asian / Pacific Islander (API) Communities

The API communities represented more than half of the presentation sample (55-percent) commensurate with Seattle's overall emerging population estimates. Similar to the African American / East African communities, the success of reaching a large population of APIs can be attributed to the strong partnerships between SPU EJNA and API-centric CBOs, namely APIWFSC, KCSKC and IDHA. All three organizations have strong and dedicated organizational

staff and consistent community-based programs with a wide membership base or reach within the API communities.

The top five ethnic groups with most participants were Filipinos, Cambodians, Mien, Chinese and Vietnamese. The Filipino population had the largest representation within the outreach program with more than 17-percent of the entire presentation sample and nearly 32-percent of the API group (157 households). All participation recruitment and outreach from the Filipino community was courtesy of APIWFSC and the Filipino Community Center weekly programs. The Cambodian community which was largely recruited by KCSKC had the third highest number of participants overall with 121 households representing over 24-percent of the entire API group.

The documentation displays a successful outreach method by utilizing current CBO partnerships and we recommend SPU EJNA's continued relationships with APIWFSC, KCSKC and IDHA for community-based outreach to API immigrant and refugee segments. Additionally, we recommend SPU explore a potential strategic partnership with Safe Futures as it has a strong connection to specifically Pacific-Islander communities.

For more information on the breakdown of ethnicity, see Section 3.0.b under ETHNICITY.

Hispanic / Latino Communities

The Hispanic / Latino communities represented slightly more than nine-percent of the outreach program population (83 total households). Similar to other emerging communities, strong partnerships with CBOs were the keys to the success of outreach to the Hispanic / Latino populations. In this particular case, SPU EJNA partnered with St. Mary's Church. In addition, our agency reached out to several other CBOs including El Centro de la Raza, Central Area Youth Association and Central Area Motivational Program (CAMP) for additional presentation opportunities. St. Mary's spearheaded the outreach program committed organizational staff and volunteers and utilized its church facility and congregation base for information and education.

The top two ethnic groups represented from this segment was Latino and Mexican. The Latino population was the seventh largest group throughout the outreach program with 36 total households representing four-percent of the total sample group. However, the Latino audience represented over 43-percent of the entire cultural group. The Mexican ethnic group had 27 total household participants and represented over 32-percent of the entire Hispanic / Latino group.

The documentation indicates yet another successful outreach method by utilizing St. Mary's as the current CBO partner. We recommend SPU continue its partnership with St. Mary's for community-based outreach to the Hispanic / Latino segments. We also recommend SPU EJNA explore a potential strategic partnership with El Centro de la Raza.

For more information on the breakdown of ethnicity, see Section 3.0.b under ETHNICITY.

Other Population Communities

The White and Mixed Race populations represented the remaining documented populations with 13 and eight (8) households, respectively. Additionally, 29 participants were listed as unknown or not available which represented three-percent of the entire data sample.

For more information on the breakdown of ethnicity, see Section 3.0.b under ETHNICITY.

b) Marketing and Advertising

This year's general solid waste marketing campaign rollout which consisted of directly mail, radio, television, transit billboard, newspaper, events and online advertising achieved moderate success with the immigrant and refugee communities. Just over 40-percent of

those that attended the presentations indicated they had heard about the changes prior to the outreach presentations.

However, in addition to the general overall advertising, marketing and public relations campaign, we recommend SPU EJNA continue its CBO partnerships for community-based education and outreach. We also recommend SPU make significant investments into a targeted direct mail campaign that focuses on in-language translation and English as it pertains to geographic areas. The following are high priority zip codes and neighborhoods with critical areas of emphasis that should be a part of this direct mail campaign due to high concentrations of cultural groups (arranged in order of highest sum of households in solid waste outreach):

- 1) 98118: South Beacon Hill / Rainier Beach (East African, API and Hispanic / Latino)
- 2) 98108: Beacon Hill (East African, API and Hispanic / Latino)
- 3) 98106: White Center / Delridge (API)
- 4) 98144: Beacon Hill / North Rainier (East African, API and Hispanic / Latino)
- 5) 98178: Skyway (API)
- 6) 98168: Georgetown (East African and API)
- 7) 98104: International District / First Hill (East African and API)
- 8) 98126: White Center / Highpoint (East African and API)
- 9) 98122: Central District (East African, API and Hispanic / Latino)
- 10) 98146: Burien / Highline (API and Hispanic / Latino)

We also recommend future in-language print advertising as another advertising and public relations strategy to compliment the overall general marketing strategy. Provided allowable budget, advertising dollars should be spent in the following in-language communities: Khmer (Cambodian), Tagalog (Filipino), Chinese, Amharic (Ethiopian) and Spanish. Additional investments should be made in Korean, Vietnamese and Russian since they are included as the most common foreign language spoken in Seattle. Cultural sensitivity to the print ad designs must be included and developed by those with multicultural experience and background. The translated advertisements should stand alone from current English versions.

Lastly, we recommend participation within cultural events to be included in SPU EJNA's comprehensive marketing and advertising plan. Each of the respective cultural communities have ethnic celebrations, festivals and events – of which SPU EJNA should take part with either a booth or as a part of the event programming (i.e. on-stage performance, presentation, etc). Should staff resources and availability become an issue, SPU may consider working CBO partners or event consultants on their behalf to distribute in-language marketing materials as well as collect and gather additional data from the various ethnic communities. Again, language and interpretation capabilities and in-language materials are a must for information distribution at these various events.

c) Presentation Delivery and Effectiveness

The success of the outreach to immigrant communities depends heavily on the strength of the CBO partner leads and their ability to facilitate presentations. Those CBO partners that were prepared or well-rehearsed were more effective in the communication of solid waste program changes. We recommend SPU EJNA continue its partnerships with strong CBOs to lead future outreach presentations and delivery.

In addition, interpretation from the CBO partner or presentation location host / facility is critical to the understanding and comprehension of communication and outreach efforts. A total of 12 different languages were spoken at the various presentations. Khmer, Tagalog, Cantonese, Amharic and Spanish were the most common languages spoken. Interpretation assists with building community and audience trust and will enable the surveying for accurate audience responses.

The most effective presentation tools were the in-language translations of the "Where Does It Go" flyer and display board. Our studies have found that visual elements were helpful and materials must be translated in-language for successful education and outreach. PowerPoint also proved to be useful in certain environments with the ability to incorporate images of ethnic recyclables and foods to assist with cultural identification. This was clearly identified within the Ethiopian and Chinese communities.

6.0 Appendix

a) CBO Roster

Seattle Public Utilities - Environmental Justice Network in Action (EJNA)			
Community-Based Organization (CBO) Partner Roster			
Revised: 7/1/09			
Blue = CBO Executive Director		Marcella Cell:	206.371.5394
Red = CBO Project Lead / Staff		Michael Cell:	206.786.9769
Green = CBO Ambassador		Nic Cell:	206.226.1959
Name	Address	Phone Number	E-mail
Asian & Pacific Islander Women & Family Safety Center (APIWFSC) - Lead: Nic; 2nd: Marcella			
Lan Pham	P.O Box 14047, Seattle, WA 98114	2064679976	lan@apialliance.org
Emma Catague	P.O Box 14047, Seattle, WA 98114	2064679976	emma@apialliance.org
Mey Saelee	P.O Box 14047, Seattle, WA 98114	2068541558	soujimey-saephanh@msn.com
Emerita Gaviola	P.O Box 14047, Seattle, WA 98114	2064679976	
Dado V. Saturay	P.O Box 14047, Seattle, WA 98114	2067229372	drs_fes@yahoo.com
Horn of Africa Services (HOAS) - Lead: Marcella; 2nd: Michael			
Tsegaye Gebru	4714 Rainier Ave S, Ste 105 Seattle 98118	2067600550	tsegaye66@gmail.com
Tigist Teshome	4714 Rainier Ave S, Ste 105 Seattle 98118	8987894	mamilu777@yahoo.com
Lulit Merio	4714 Rainier Ave S, Ste 105 Seattle 98118	2067600550	elulitla_20@yahoo.com
Ethiopia Alemneh	4714 Rainier Ave S, Ste 105 Seattle 98118	2062346830	ethiopy2000@hotmail.com
International District Housing Alliance (IDHA) - Lead: Nic; 2nd: Michael			
Sharyne Shiu-Thornton	606 Maynard Ave S, Seattle WA 98114	2066235132	sharyne@apialliance.org
Casey China	606 Maynard Ave S, Seattle WA 98114	2066235132	casey@apialliance.org
Quyet Huynh	606 Maynard Ave S, Seattle WA 98114	2066235132 x324	quyet@apialliance.org
Jian Qing Zhao	606 Maynard Ave S, Seattle WA 98114	2066235132	darksnow@hotmail.com
Shumin Lin	606 Maynard Ave S, Seattle WA 98114	2066235132	jessice_min2009@hotmail.com
Khmer Community of Seattle / King County - Lead: Marcella; 2nd: Nic			
Lim Leng	10025 16th Ave SW, Seattle, 98146		lenglim2002@yahoo.com
Thuong Thanh	10025 16th Ave SW, Seattle, 98146	2067623922	thuongthanh05@yahoo.com
Khydar L Musa	10025 16th Ave SW, Seattle, 98146	2067623922	khydar@gmail.com
Kimsan Tong	10025 16th Ave SW, Seattle, 98146	2067623922	
Touch Young	10025 16th Ave SW, Seattle, 98146	2067623922	touch_young@yahoo.com
PASEFIKA - Lead: Michael; 2nd: Nic			
Mabel Fatialufa-Magalei	10237 16th Ave SW Seattle, WA 98146	2065217235	danandmabel@comcast.net
Doris Tevaseu	10237 16th Ave SW Seattle, WA 98146	4259850151	dtevaseu@hotmail.com
Glenn Leituala	10237 16th Ave SW Seattle, WA 98146	2533325620	kelegi08@yahoo.com
Somali Community Service of Seattle (SCSS) - Lead: Marcella; 2nd: Michael			
Farah Sarah	3320 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98144	2067601115	farahsarah@yahoo.com
Farhiya Mohamend	3320 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98144	2064984518	farhiya79@hotmail.com
Baroon Ahmed	3320 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98144	2063132953	Baroona09@yahoo.com
St. Mary's - Lead: Sheryl; 2nd: Nic			
Tricia Wittmantodd	611 20th Ave S, Seattle, WA 98114	2063847547	triciawittmantodd@hotmail.com
Isom Taylor	611 20th Ave S, Seattle, WA 98114	2065685452	itaylor@uijima.biz
Lupita Zamora	611 20th Ave S, Seattle, WA 98114		mqzalatorre@hotmail.com
Ana Zeek	611 20th Ave S, Seattle, WA 98114	2064597653	azeek@holynames-sea.org
Noel Younger	611 20th Ave S, Seattle, WA 98114	2063847547	nyounger@holynames-sea.org
Michele Myers	611 20th Ave S, Seattle, WA 98114	2063847547	mversmrose2@yahoo.com

b) Presentation Schedule

Seattle Public Utilities - Environmental Justice Network Action (EJNA)									
Community-Based Organization (CBO) Presentation Locations									
Revised: 7/9/09									
Organization	CBO Contacts	Phone	Program	Location	Date	Time	Confirmed	Done	Forms
APIWESC	Emma Cataque Mey Saetle Emerita Gavila	206.679.2174 206.854.1558 201.256.7319	Tuesday Senior Luncheon Thursday Senior Luncheon Citizenship Potluck	Filipino Community Center Filipino Community Center Filipino Community Center	7-Apr 23-Apr 9-May	Noon-1pm Noon-1pm 1-4pm	X X X	X X X	X X X
	Dado V. Satway	206.722.9372	Hmong / Mien Luncheon Lao Highland Luncheon Parenting and Youth Programs	Filipino Community Center Filipino Community Center Lao Highland Association	20-May 5-Jun 6-Jun	11am-Noon 11am-Noon 11am-Noon	X X X	X X X	X X X
HOAS	Tsegaye Gebtru Tigist Teshome Lulit Merio	206.280.8904 206.898.7894 206.760.0550	Youth Program Women's Program Meeting Workshop Computer Training Class Workshop	Medhane Alem Evangelical Church Medhane Alem Evangelical Church National Union of Eritrean Women Horn of Africa Services Rinoboth Ethiopian Church	9-Apr 12-Apr 2-May 15-May 21-Jun	7-7:30pm 12:30-1pm 6-7pm 11am-Noon 2-3pm	X X X X X	X X X X X	X X n/a X X
	Ethiopia Alemneh	206.234.6830	Coffee Hour Program	Medhane Alem Evangelical Church	28-Jun	11am-Noon	X	X	X
IDHA	Casey China Qiyet Huynh Jian Qing Zhao	720.308.5834 206.623.5132 206.623.5132	April Community Resident Meeting South Beacon Hill Neighborhood Council ESL Program Composting Club / Luncheon Teen Advisory Meeting Family Center / ESL Class Combo	IDHA St. Mark's Lutheran Church ID / Chinatown Community Center Garfield High School Jefferson Community Center Chinese Information Service Center	29-Apr 6-May 20-May 1-Jun 17-Jun 19-Jun	4-5pm 7-8:30pm 3:30-4:30pm 11:40am-12:40pm 3-4pm 11:30am-12:30pm	X X X X X X	X X X X X X	X X X X X X
	Shumin Lin	206.623.5132							
KCSKC	Thuong Thanh Khydar Musa Kimsan Tong	206.383.9606 206.852.3334 206.762.3922	Cambodian New Year Luncheon Citizenship Class (Sat only) Youth Program (Sat only) Senior Companion Program (Sat only) Computer Education Class (Sat only) Cambodian Language Program	KCSKC KCSKC KCSKC KCSKC KCSKC KCSKC	4-Apr 25-Apr 9-May 23-May 13-Jun 27-Jun	11am-Noon 11am-Noon 11am-Noon 11am-Noon 11am-Noon 11am-Noon	X X X X X X	X X X X X X	X X n/a X X X
PASEFIKA	Doris Tevaseu Glen Letualia	423.983.0151 253.332.5620	Intermediate ESL Program Parent Youth Group - Promoting Assets Across Cultures Parent Group - Immigrant and Refugee Families Out of School BBQ Presentation cancellation (#5 not required) Presentation to be confirmed (#6 not completed)	SW Youth & Family Services State Futures Youth Center Safe Futures Youth Center Van Assefi Community Center	23-Apr 9-Jun 9-Jun 26-Jun	5:30-7:30pm 5:30-6pm 5:30-6pm 6:30-7:30pm	X X X X	X X X X	X X X X
SCSS	Fahyza Mohamed Farah Sarah Baroon Ahmed	206.498.4518 206.760.1115 206.313.2953	Parents of Young Children Program East African Senior Lunch Program Saturday Nutrition Program Bilingual School Senior Lunch Program Senior Lunch Program	Refugee Women's Alliance Rainier Community Center SCSS Brighton Apartments International Drop-in Center Refugee Women's Alliance	4-Apr 8-Apr 2-May 22-May 22-May 26-Jun	2:30-3pm Noon-1pm Noon-1pm 10-11am 11:30-1pm 11am-Noon	X X X X X X	X X X X X X	X X X X X X
St. Mary's	Isom Taylor Lupita Zamora Ara Zeek Noel Younger Michele Myers	206.568.5452 206.459.8176 206.384.7547	Neighborhood Block Watch Meeting Coffee Hour Coffee Hour ESL and Citizenship Programs Presentation cancellation (#5 not required) Food Empowerment Education and Susial	Seattle Public Library - Douglas-Truth St. Mary's St. Mary's El Centro de la Raza WorkSource Seattle-King County Youngstown Cultural Arts Center	14-Apr 26-Apr 26-Apr 5-May 22-Jun 1-Jul	6:15-7:45pm 10:45-11:45am 1:15-2:15pm 5:30-6:30pm 12:30-2:30pm 5:30-6:30pm	X X X X X X	X X X X X X	X X X X X X

c) Reporting Form Sample

PRESENTATION - REPORTING FORM Environmental Justice Network in Action (2009) CBO Name: _____
--

Date of Presentation: _____

Name of Group: _____

Location: _____

ATTENDANCE

CBO Staff: _____ CBO Staff: _____

Ambassador: _____

Number of people attending (excluding CBO staff & ambassador): _____

PRESENTATION

Who Presented:

CBO Staff Name: _____

Ambassador Name: _____

Who took notes?

CBO Staff Name: _____

Ambassador Name: _____

Other Staff: _____

Was interpretation necessary: Yes No

Which Language(s): _____

Evaluation Questions for the Audience

Please ask these questions at the last 5-10 minutes of your presentation. Just ask for people to raise their hands to answer them, and then someone needs to record the answers on this sheet.

1. Please raise your hand if you had already heard about the changes to your collection services before I talked about it today.

_____ **Yes** _____ **No** _____ **No response**

If yes, how did you hear about it?

_____ **Received info in mail** _____ **Radio** _____ **TV** _____ **Bus signs**

_____ **Newspaper** _____ **Community event**

2. Please raise your hand if this presentation helped you understand the changes to your collection services.

_____ **Yes** _____ **No** _____ **No response**

3. Please raise your hand if you are willing to share this information with others.

_____ **Yes** _____ **No** _____ **No Response**

4. Are there any more comments or questions?

CBO Questions

1. How helpful was the training in preparing you to engage your community during this presentation?

___1 Not helpful ___2 Somewhat helpful ___3 Helpful ___4 Very helpful

Please explain your answer

2. Which outreach tools/materials were most effective during this presentation?
(displays, incentives, brochures, etc.)

Least effective?

3. What would you change (if anything) about the logistics (room set up, location, time etc.) of the presentation & why?

4. What would you change (if anything) about the way you presented the information & why?

PRESENTATION - Sign-in Sheet

Environmental Justice Network in Action (2009)

Ask your community participants to fill in the following information.

	<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Zip Code</u>	<u>Household Size</u>	Apt	House	H/A
1.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

d) Reporting Form Responses Data

See attached Excel file SPU EJNA SW Outreach Reporting Data vFinal (SPU).

7.0 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank and acknowledge all of the following individuals and organizations for their contributions to making this report possible:

Ana Zeek	<i>St. Mary's Church</i>
Baroon Ahmed	<i>Somali Community Services of Seattle</i>
Berta Sugiyani	<i>T.D. Wang Advertising Group, LLC</i>
Caroline Li	<i>T.D. Wang Advertising Group, LLC</i>
Casey China	<i>International District Housing Alliance</i>
Dado Saturday	<i>Asian & Pacific Islander Women & Family Safety Center</i>
Doris Tevaseu	<i>Pasefika</i>
Emerita Gaviola	<i>Asian & Pacific Islander Women & Family Safety Center</i>
Emma Catague	<i>Asian & Pacific Islander Women & Family Safety Center</i>
Ethiopia Alemneh	<i>Horn of Africa Services</i>
Farah Sarah	<i>Somali Community Services of Seattle</i>
Farhiya Mohamend	<i>Somali Community Services of Seattle</i>
Glenn Leituala	<i>Pasefika</i>
Isom Taylor	<i>St. Mary's Church</i>
Jian Qing Zhao	<i>International District Housing Alliance</i>
Khydar Musa	<i>Khmer Community of Seattle King County</i>
Kimsan Tong	<i>Khmer Community of Seattle King County</i>
Lulit Merio	<i>Horn of Africa Services</i>
Lupita Zamora	<i>St. Mary's Church</i>
Marcella Wilson	<i>Seattle Public Utilities – Environmental Justice Network in Action</i>
Marcia Rutan	<i>Seattle Public Utilities</i>
Mey Saelee	<i>Asian & Pacific Islander Women & Family Safety Center</i>
Michael Davis	<i>Seattle Public Utilities – Environmental Justice Network in Action</i>
Michele Myers	<i>St. Mary's Church</i>
Miki Kanada	<i>Somali Community Services of Seattle</i>
Nic Li	<i>Seattle Public Utilities – Environmental Justice Network in Action</i>
Noel Younger	<i>St. Mary's Church</i>
Quyet Huynh	<i>International District Housing Alliance</i>
Sheryl Shapiro	<i>Seattle Public Utilities – Environmental Justice Network in Action</i>
Shumin Lin	<i>International District Housing Alliance</i>
Thuong Thanh	<i>Khmer Community of Seattle King County</i>
Tigist Teshome	<i>Horn of Africa Services</i>
Touch Young	<i>Khmer Community of Seattle King County</i>
Tricia Wittmantodd	<i>St. Mary's Church</i>
Tsegaye Gebru	<i>Horn of Africa Services</i>
Victoria Wong	<i>T.D. Wang Advertising Group, LLC</i>